DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 102 HE 017 853

TITLE Alcohol on Campus.
INSTITUTION Association of College Unions-International, Bloomington, IN.
PUB DATE Oct 84
NOTE 10p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120)
JOURNAL CIT ACU-I Bulletin; v52 n5 p15-23 Oct 1984

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Alcohol Education; Alcoholic Beverages; Change Strategies; College Environment; *College Students; *Drinking; Educational Objectives; Higher Education; Knowledge Level; Program Evaluation; Recreational Activities; *Social Life; *Student Attitudes; Student Behavior

ABSTRACT

Alcohol use on campus and strategies colleges are using to educate students about alcohol are considered in two articles. In "When Alternatives Aren't," Ruth Bradford Burnham and Stephen J. Nelson explore the role alcoholic beverages play in young people's social lives and some of the implications for planning social events. They offer a balanced approach to social programming that emphasizes quality and choices and avoids the extremes of "either/or" and "wet/dry." Frances Oblander's article, "A Practice-Oriented Synthesis: Effective Alcohol Education Strategies," reviews the published and fugitive literature on the impact of alcohol education strategies, including evaluation reports from institutions that have established alcohol education programs. Attention is directed to the success of several strategies in altering students' knowledge, attitudes, and behavior related to alcohol use. Information is provided on the results of campus program evaluations, evaluation studies utilizing the classroom environment, and evaluation of voluntary participation alcohol education activities. Appended is a list of agencies and organizations that provide alcohol information and publications. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ACU-I

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED255102

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Alcohol on campus

National Collegiate Alcohol Awareness Week, Oct. 8-14, focuses on the growing need for continuing alcohol education programming on all campuses. BACCHUS and several national organizations representing student affairs personnel encourage faculty, staff, and students to observe Alcohol Awareness Week by identifying creative ways to address the alcohol issue in classrooms, residence halls, and student activities.

This month's feature section takes a look at alcohol use on campus and the strategies schools are using to educate their students about alcohol. The first article, "When alternatives aren't," explores the role alcoholic beverages play in young people's social lives and some of the implications of this for those responsible for college social programming. In this article, Ruth Bradford Burnham and Stephen J. Nelson offer a balanced approach to programming that emphasizes quality and choices and avoids the extremes of "either/or" and "wet/dry."

In "A practice-oriented synthesis: Effective alcohol education strategies," Frances Oblander reviews the published and fugitive literature on the impact of alcohol education strategies, including evaluation reports from institutions that have established alcohol education programs. The author discusses the success of several strategies in altering students' knowledge, attitudes, and behavior related to alcohol use and offers a "collection of best practices."

This feature section ends on a very practical note: a list of agencies and organizations which will provide alcohol information and publications.

Photo illustration by J.D. Scott

When "alternatives" aren't

Ruth Bradford Burnham and Stephen J. Nelson

There is national concern about the use of alcoholic beverages by undergraduate college students. There is also concern, interest, and a great deal of variety in colleges' responses to this issue. Some of the variables that come into play include students' precollege attitudes and experiences, local and state laws, and the institution's policies, programs, and actions. One of the biggest challenges for many schools involves the integration of greek and other social programming into a total picture that takes into account the social and recreational needs and interests of students and the institution's responsibility to maintain its academic community.

Alcohol in campus social life

It is clear that the use of alcoholic beverages plays a primary role in the social lives of undergraduate college students. Most researchers believe there has been little change in young adult consumption levels, at most, a slight increase in the post-World War II years. Alcohol's central place and college students' drinking behaviors are not peculiar to the college student scene; they are reflected in the drinking patterns of late adolescents and young adults in and out of college. One need only review the dif-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ficulties faced by the military services in dealing with alcohol and drug abuse among their personnel, especially those in the young-adult age group, to see that this issue transcends the university setting.

For educators, and especially for those involved in campus life and activities, the reliance of students on alcohol and the frequent abuse of alcohol appear to be excessive. The amount of drinking may not have changed significantly in recent years; what has changed is that students are entering college with more drinking experience (i.e., drinking more at increasingly younger ages). There is also the perception that the reasons for drinking and drunkenness have changed to the extent that getting drunk is an end in itself. What might reasonably be labeled as "social drinking" appears as the exception rather than the rule. An equation has developed in which alcohol equals having fun or having a good time. And the converse is believed to be equally true: one cannot have a real party or activity without alcohol.

It is important to understand the background elements which explain and at the same time complicate the situation for those working in the area of campus activities and programs. In the early to mid-1970s, drinking ages were lowered in many states from 20 and 21 years of age to 18. This led to the development of college pubs on many campuses. For the first time on a large scale, colleges became involved in selling alcoholic beverages to their students. These facilities were promoted for a variety of reasons, ranging from economic factors to the development of places where members of the college community could gather in a pleasant atmosphere with some control.

At the same time, major alcoholic beverage distributors, primarily those selling beer and wine, began massive promotional campaigns to place their products in front of the student audience. Many of these companies have admitted that they were attempting to hook young adults on their particular brands on the assumption that it would become the lifelong alcoholic beverage of choice for those college students. Many of the campus pubs were well-supervised and managed and have provided spaces where alcoholic and nonalcoholic beverages can coexist.

At the same time, professionals involved with student activities and college unions were also faced with student pressure to incorporate alcohol into other programs to ensure their success, increasing the popularity of beer blasts, inexpensive happy hours, beer with movies (sometimes directly sponsored by specific companies), and the like. Such internal and external pressure created ethical dilemmas for student personnel administrators and other members of college communities.

The social alternatives trap

In addition to these ethical quandaries, the issue of alcohol on campus and its use within programs spawns other predicaments. The first of these is the issue of the responsible use of alcohol. The term "responsible use" has arisen in recent years and has been applied to the manner in which alcoholic beverages should be consumed. Brewers' and distillers' associations have been among the primary proponents of this posture. Certainly responsible use is desirable if the only other choice is irresponsible use. At the same time, we must ask how far we can use this kind of terminology. If one can talk about the responsible use of alcohol, can one then talk about the responsible use of marijuana, cocaine, heroin, or any number of other drugs found alongside alcohol in our culture? Alcohol for those who are underage is no more nor less illegal than other drugs, even though the penalties for getting caught vary. Even for those who are of legal drinking age, the use of alcoholic beverages should still be within the bounds of personal and community responsibility.

"Using the language of 'alternative programs' or 'social alternatives' supports the notion that those places where alcohol is the main focus of the activity are the norm."

"Responsible use" has crept into the jargon of the alcohol education field. For responsible use to be a meaningful and helpful concept, its implications and goals must be clearly understood. It cannot be viewed as each person drinking just barely within what he or she perceives to be a personal limit or, put another way, drinking almost to excess at every drinking occasion. More clarity may result from thinking of each individual, our various groups, and our college communities as operating responsibly with respect to alcoholic beverages.

A second predicament results from labeling as "alternative programs" or "social alternatives" those activities where there is no alcohol or where alcohol is not the focus. The use of the word *alternative* immediately raises the question: alternative to what? The answer is, alternative to alcohol and in particular to those events which get out of hand because of alcohol abuse.

There is a problem of semantics inherent in referring to something as an alternative. For example, suppose you are traveling on an interstate highway and come upon construction detouring traffic to an alternate route. It is apparent that this is an alternative to the main route and is often not as fast, easy, or good as the main route. Using the language of "alternative programs" or "social alternatives" supports the notion that those places where alcohol is the main focus of the activity are the norm. What, in fact, should be considered the norm? Why not see those events which are geared toward heavy drinking and alcohol abuse as the alternatives?

It is also important to avoid overreacting to alcohol-focused events by polarizing the social situation so that the only other position is providing events where alcohol is not available at all. Certainly there can and should be some events at which alcohol is not available, where the entertainment, creative nonalcoholic beverages, good food, and the like are the main attractions. But if the only social choices are alcohol-focused and nonalcohol events, then we have a situation which is as unreal as the single choice of alcohol-focused events in the first place. There should be events where alcohol is available along with the other components. Examples would be campus pubs or cafés offering a wide variety of beverages and other menu items, and programs such as dinner theaters and nightclubs with entertainment where diversified menu and beverage options are available. In such settings, the potential for alcohol abuse is controlled by other factors competing for attention with the alcohol and contributing to social fun without reliance

or emphasis on alcohol. Thus, we can make a significant change in thinking by using the language of "social options" or "choices" rather than "alternatives."

A balanced approach

Beyond thinking of program offerings as social options or choices as opposed to alternatives, what additional ideas will assist in providing attractive, balanced activities? One way to avoid a negative perception of programs and activities is to make them part of the mainstream of campus social life.

Earlier a rather bleak assumption was developed concerning student attraction to and reliance on alcohol-focused events. A more realistic picture reflects the fact that many students are less dependent on alcohol than either we or they think. Surveys at Dartmouth College reveal at least 40 percent to 60 percent of students fitting a light to light-moderate level of use (three to five drinks per week or less). Other colleges and universities have found similar results, including the finding that students believe there is more drinking going on than is actually the case.

Students most heavily involved with alcohol often dominate the social scene in terms of both event planning and the perception of what is actually going on at a party. These students contribute a great deal to the abusive and raucous behavior that results. The heaviest drinkers and socializers are actually a small minority within most student communities as well as within the population as a whole. The majority of students are drinkers who will occasionally abuse alcohol, but are usually responsible to themselves and others in their socializing. Ironically, it is often seniors or other upperclass students who have grown out of the rowdier behavior and who find a continuation of such practices distasteful and unenjoyable. These students yearn for something else and at the same time find themselves trapped by what they perceive to be the desires of the crowd. They will respond favorably to events that are better controlled, provide an opportunity for interaction, and are therefore more fun. If those who are responsible for student life and activities can get mainstream students involved in the planning and implementation of such events, it is likely that a snowball effect will occur and the alternative label can be avoided.

The second challenge is to develop programs that do not resemble what people think of as alternatives—programs that stand on their own merits. Again, this task may look easier said than done. It can be accomplished if predicated on the groundwork of discerning those things of interest to students beyond what is offered on campus and encouraging and supporting the planning of those events and activities. To do so, one can rely on things which conjure up traditions of the college or university. Also the programs should emphasize some of the basic student needs such as gaining acceptance, being well-liked, wanting to be seen in the company of certain peers, and feeling a sense of self-worth and pleasure.

Third, it is important to avoid defensiveness in describing social options. These new programs need not be debated even if some within the community choose to assail their merits, especially in the face of the "alcohol equals fun" equation. Engaging in arguments is unlikely to produce any increased support and may serve only to reinforce those who would wish to categorize such events as "alternatives," appealing only to a small segment of the population. The events themselves need not be large in scale nor receive immediate widespread popularity. The important consideration is that they exist for those who are interested and are not viewed as a reaction to or replacement of other social activities that dominate the scene. The campus community may be served if the addition of new choices displaces some old things; however, this should not be the goal of new programming. If new ideas are treated positively there may be those on campus who will imitate them.

The semantics and intentions of what we do are extremely important and should not be underestimated. Campus social life can be enhanced and enriched by opening up social options. On every campus there are those students who are looking for and will support such initiatives. While there may be a seemingly overwhelming inertia and dead-end feeling about alcohol-focused programming, it may be only one social way station. The support exists for paving the road beyond; all that is needed are those who are willing to offer a new direction.

Ruth Bradford Burnham is coordinator of student activities at Bucknell University. Stephen J. Nelson is director of the Collis College Center at Dartmouth College.

A practice oriented synthesis:

Effective alcohol education strategies

Frances W. Oblander

Popularity of alcohol education is a relatively recent priority in student services. A review of the literature over the last 10 years shows a steady increase in the number of articles pertaining to alcohol. Many articles portray activities in a show-and-tell fashion, sharing program ideas from individual campuses. Most other articles addressing alcohol-related topics focus on drinking behavior of college students. Finally, a few articles discuss intervention and educational programming models. To date, few articles in the primary student affairs journals have addressed the effectiveness of a given alcohol education strategy or program.

Increasingly, campus administrators are emphasizing alcohol abuse and the resulting campus problems. Anywhere from 71 to 90 percent of college students drink (Engs & Hanson, in press; Kuder & Madson, 1976; Strange & Schmidt, 1979). When this drinking is abusive, a variety of negative consequences hinders a student's ability to be active and productive in the college community. Alcohol abuse has become a major concern on campuses. With this concern, a variety of alcohol education activities ranging from awareness days to full-blown peer counseling and education centers has emerged.

Student affairs staffs face a new dilemma as they develop approaches for alcohol education. Determining

appropriate goals for alcohol education and how they can be achieved is essential in addressing this topic. Programs now focus on responsible choice; whether this approach is more effective than the abstinence-oriented approach or treatment focus is still uncertain.

Alcohol education is most often defined as those activities designed to:

1. Involve individuals in discussion of problems and issues associated with alcohol;
2. Recognize the reasons why people use alcohol;
3. Recognize the effects and use of alcohol on individuals and their peers;
4. Suggest how and why responsible decisions about alcohol are made;
5. Recognize that irresponsible alcohol use can be harmful to self and others;
6. Recognize that decision making is an individual and personal act;
7. Establish criteria for decisions regarding responsible use of alcohol;
8. Establish campus norms that promote positive use of alcohol and restrict negative use. (Dean & Bryan, 1982, p. 48)

Most current alcohol education programs assume that students can learn to drink responsibly, and that it is important for drinkers and nondrinkers to review and then adjust or reaffirm their drinking decisions. For example, many young nondrinkers may base their nondrinking choice on fear or emotional reasons which break down easily in the college community where drinking is the primary mode of group affiliation. By developing a decision based on facts and understanding, the student can begin to feel more comfortable and confident as a nondrinker in a drinking environment. The other side of this is encouraging greater acceptance and tolerance of others' choices about alcohol consumption.

The primary goals of most programs are to increase knowledge, increase responsible attitudes, and increase responsible behavior.

The measurement of responsible behavior and attitude is difficult to define because it varies by individual. By suggesting what is not responsible, a picture of responsibility can be portrayed. "Alcohol abuse is best defined not by quantity of alcohol consumed, but rather in terms of behavioral consequences incurred due to the excessive use of the beverage" (Brooks, 1981, p. 186).

Finally, there are some general assumptions about the nature of alcohol problems for college students that must be considered. An alcohol problem for an individual student bears little similarity to the definition of an alcoholic. The student will seldom have chronic problems with family or jobs and does not normally experience withdrawal if alcohol is taken away. The collegiate problems of alcohol are usually direct consequences of a drinking episode or situation: damage, litter, or driving while intoxicated (Mills, Neal & Peed-Neal, 1983). For most students, drinking is associated with having a good time and feeling good. Alcohol is used predominantly as a lubricant for social cohesiveness.

Methodology

Data collection steps include (1) a review of the literature, (2) request for reports on college-level research from the National Institute for Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA), and (3) contacting active alcohol education programs.

Through *Resources in Education* and the *Current Index to Journals in Education* source books from January 1978 to May 1983, a review of the literature was performed. This review resulted in a collection of 105 articles and papers on alcohol and drug education and the evaluation of such programs. The articles came primarily from specialty journals not normally used by student affairs practitioners. They included the *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, Journal of Drug Education, Journal of School Health, Health Education, Journal of the American College Health Association, Alcohol Health and Research World, Curriculum, American Educational Research Journal, High School Journal, Education Canada, R.Q.*, and *Evaluation Quarterly*. The *Journal of College Student Personnel* and *NASPA Journal* contained a few evaluation studies and many articles used for background data.

The NIAAA provided reports on the 50 + 12 project and four campus-specific evaluation reports. The 50 + 12 project, completed in 1975, resulted in the publication of *The Whole College Catalog About Drinking*. "50 + 12" signified the 50 schools, one in each state, plus twelve other schools which represented minorities and other special populations not well represented in the first 50 schools (Kraft, D., 1976; Kraft, D., 1977.)

The third step in data collection utilized the network of known alcohol education programs. For each contact, the resource campus was asked to send any written impact evaluation reports on its program and to recommend other programs doing evaluation. Very few programs are doing impact evaluation. This networking process resulted in the names of eight institutions. One campus no longer had a program, and three did not have any evaluation reports. The campus without a program did have a report on a past program. Of the four remaining programs, two were also part of the NIAAA grant program from the 50 + 12 project.

A number of decision rules were used to pare the data down to 21 studies. First, all studies that did not attempt to measure the impact of an alcohol education program were eliminated. This included those studies that evaluated drug education programs with little or no emphasis on alcohol. Next, all studies which dealt with noncollege participants were eliminated. Finally, those studies which focused on treatment rather than prevention were eliminated. The largest number of studies were eliminated because they dealt with noncollege groups.

Limitations

There are unique problems in self-report surveys, used in most of the studies reported. A reported change may be the result of an actual change or because a respondent has determined what is expected and reports such. For example, after completing a workshop on responsible drinking, a student may check responses which indicate a more responsible attitude or behavior, regardless of actual behavior. Knowledge change is easier to measure because there is a right or wrong answer.

A second problem, unresolvable within the scope of this study, was the comparability of different questionnaires (used by different researchers) purported to measure the same things: knowledge, behavior, and attitudes related to alcohol. Even with imperfect evaluation methods, the outcome of the reported studies provides some insight into more successful and less successful attempts in alcohol education.

Results

The following tables categorized results:

1. Campus program evaluations;

2. Evaluation studies utilizing the classroom environment; and
3. Evaluation of voluntary participation alcohol education activities.

Campus programs. Table 1 shows that measured student knowledge about alcohol increased at all but one campus. Program evaluations spanning more than one year also indicated significant shifts in attitude toward drinking. Measures included an increase in perceived "social support for drinking only one drink per hour," "social disapproval of drinking heavily," and "increases in students reporting intentions to drink responsibly" (McKillip, 1981; UNC-CH, 1981; Kraft & Hornik, 1980). Findings were inconclusive or not significant for most programs' ability to decrease incidents of alcohol-related negative behavior consequences except in the area of driving under the influence. Program activities on drinking and driving resulted in an attitude shift toward stricter enforcement of drunk driving laws (UNC-CH, 1981). There was also a significant decrease in self-reported drinking and driving incidents (Kraft, J., 1979, 1981).

The workshop format received variable effectiveness ratings; one campus saw no change after workshop activities in behavior or attitudes (UNC-CH, 1981). Two other campuses reported that students, in survey results, indicated behavior and attitude changes as a result of workshop activities (Duston, Kraft & Jaworski, 1981; Kraft & Hornik, 1980; Kraft, J., 1979, 1981).

Media campaigns including a direct mail activity showed the highest response and recognition rate on all campuses, with 80 percent to 90 percent of students responding that they had read a pamphlet or mailer targeted for study (UNC-CH, 1981).

One institution reported that educational activities incorporated into student-sponsored social activities had the highest participation rates (UNC-CH, 1981). Finally, two schools with fairly comprehensive evaluations indicated a significant decrease in consumption (McKillip, 1981; UNC-CH, 1981). Of the remaining schools, one did not discuss consumption and the other two reported that consumption stayed constant or increased.

Evaluation studies using classroom environment. Five of the studies shown in Table 2 reviewed the impact of alcohol education on knowledge level (Blum, Rivers, Horvat & Bellows, 1980; Portnoy, 1980; Robinson, 1981; Rozelle, 1980; and Rozelle & Gonzalez, 1979). In all five cases, there was a statistically significant increase in knowledge for all types of

TABLE 1
Campus Program Evaluations

SOURCE	PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	Significant change in: KNOWLEDGE	ATTITUDE	BEHAVIOR
Duston, Kraft, & Jaworski (1981) Kraft & Hornik (1980)	1. To look at annual trends of alcohol use and alcohol issues.			
	a. Consumer survey.	NM*	NO	NO
	b. Structured interview with Head Residents.	NM	YES	YES
	2. Evaluation of intensive approaches to alcohol education.			
	a. Alcohol problem management training for residence assistants.	YES	NO	NM
	b. "Alcohol and Values" workshop.	NM	YES	NO
	c. Seminar in Alcohol Education: How to run a Colloquium.	YES	NO	NO
	3. Evaluation of extensive approaches to alcohol education.			
	a. Posters and pamphlets.	YES	NM	NM
	b. Bookmark about alcohol consumption.	YES	NM	NM
Kraft, J. (1981)	Status report of alcohol education program, 1977-81.	YES	NO	NO
Kraft, J. (1979)	Results of alcohol survey and impact of alcohol education program comparison of 1977 and 1979 survey.	YES	NO	YES
Crosby & Rubenstein (1981)	Evaluation report of campus alcohol education project (1980-81).	NM	NO	NO
McKillip (1981)	Summary of evaluation findings, SIU-C alcohol education project.	YES	YES	YES
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (1981)	1. Use of a student survey to assess the positive and negative impacts of the alcohol abuse prevention program over three years.	YES	YES	YES
	2. To study site-specific alcohol education activities.			
	a. Residence areas in south campus given 0, 1, or 2 workshops.	NM	NO	NO
	b. Workshops, films, breathtesting demonstrations, and a direct mail campaign.	NM	YES	NM
	c. Dances, a nonalcoholic bar, a film on drinking and driving and interaction with the hall government.	NM	YES	NM

**NM = Not measured*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2
Evaluation Studies Utilizing the Classroom Environment

SOURCE	PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	Significant change in: KNOWLEDGE	ATTITUDE	BEHAVIOR
Robinson (1981)	To design, implement, and compare three forms of alcohol instruction programs: 1. implicit instruction; 2. explicit instruction; and 3. values clarification.	(for all programs) YES	(explicit only) YES	NO
Portnoy (1980)	To determine the effects of a controlled usage alcohol education program, based on the Health Belief Model and persuasion communication principles, on attitudes and drinking patterns.	YES	NO	NO
Blum, Rivers, Horvat, & Bellows (1980)	To assess the effects of a specific procedure, contracted abstinence, on college students' attitudes and behaviors toward alcohol use.	YES	NO	YES
Rozelle (1980)	To determine the relative effectiveness of an innovative approach and a more traditional cognitive approach to alcohol education within the context of an academic course for undergraduates.	YES	YES	NO
Rozelle & Gonzalez (1979)	To test two curriculum approaches in alcohol education: an experiential approach, learning by doing; and a cognitive oriented classroom approach.	YES	YES	YES
Dennison, Prevet, Affleck (1977)	To develop an Alcohol Behavior Inventory (ABI) that would measure the drinking severity of alcohol-related behavior of university students. To develop and evaluate a presentation of the Alcohol Instructional Model (AIM). AIM includes a field experience, cognitive and affective components.	NM*	NM	YES
Dennison & Prevet (1980)	To develop and implement an alcohol intervention program for youth, directed at dangerous and disruptive behaviors. The program included cognitive, affective, and experiential components.	NM	NM	YES
Dennison (1977)	To test the effects of an educational model which focused on cognitive information, affective instruction, and selected field activities.	NM	NM	YES

**NM = not measured*

treatment. All eight studies, in addition to knowledge change, looked at changes in attitudes and/or behavior. Behavior changes were measured by decreases in negative consequences directly related to consumption including drinking and driving, fighting, property damage, or serious arguments. Attitude change was measured by increases in self-reported instances of responsible thoughts regarding alcohol consumption and drinking pattern shifts toward more moderate consumption.

Blum, Rivers, Horvat & Bellow (1980) looked specifically at the use of "contracted abstinence." Although the authors found no significant change in attitude, the process did seem to cause students to think about alcohol and their own consumption. Several students were surprised by how much they depend on alcohol at social activities. Participants in the contracted abstinence exercise showed a trend toward increased tolerance for nondrinkers. Several students reacted by saying they would not participate without receiving copies of the contract to show friends at parties.

Three studies (Dennison, 1977; Dennison, Prevet & Affleck, 1977; and Dennison & Prevet, 1980) looked specifically at behavior change. All three studies used the same alcohol education model (see Table 2, Dennison, Prevet & Affleck, 1977) with varying results. Each reported a decrease in negative behavior including: general decrease in disruptive behavior (Dennison, Prevet & Affleck, 1977); decrease in only non-automobile related disruptive behavior (Dennison & Prevet, 1980); and decrease in drinking and driving behavior and fewer intoxication episodes (Dennison, 1977).

In the Robinson (1981) study, which compared implicit versus explicit instruction, attitudes became less favorable for students in implicit instruction groups. Those students in the explicit instruction group who received specific recommendations for responsible drinking and for responses to alcohol-related situations exhibited more favorable attitudes toward moderate alcohol use.

The remaining two studies which looked at attitudes (Rozelle, 1980; Rozelle & Gonzalez, 1979) showed that students who participated in experiential activities in addition to cognitive learning showed significant increases in responsible attitudes toward drinking. In one of these studies (Rozelle & Gonzalez, 1979), the cognitive approach also resulted in a significant increase in responsible attitudes and decrease in negative behavior consequences.

Volunteer participation alcohol education activities. The studies summarized in Table 3 involve voluntary participation in alcohol education activities. Each activity looked at different changes in participants in the areas of knowledge, behavior, and attitude. As before, all studies that looked for change in student knowledge about alcohol found increases in knowledge for participating students.

Chen, Dorsch, and Cychosz (1982) examined differences in drinking attitudes and behaviors before

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and after an alcohol awareness week. Activities included sessions on communication, drinking and driving, sexuality, and stress management. Pledges of responsible drinking were collected, and residence halls competed for awards by providing the most alternative activities and number of pledges. The results indicated no significant differences in drinking attitudes. The study did find a significant shift in motivation to drink, away from problem-related responses to responses such as "enjoy the taste" and "because my friends do." There was also a significant decrease in reports of "driving under the influence" (Chen, Dorsch & Cychosz, 1982, p. 131). Heavy drinking showed a significant decrease between preprogram population and postprogram participating population.

The study performed by Engs, DeCoster, Larson, and McPherson (1978) illustrated the effects of cognitive alcohol education modules in significantly increasing knowledge levels.

Gonzalez and Wiles (1981) reviewed the results of an alcohol awareness workshop for students involved in alcohol-related policy infractions. The evaluation of this program indicated a significant increase in level of alcohol knowledge on the part of participants and a shift toward more responsible attitudes.

Gonzalez (1980) designed a study to determine if an alcohol education module "would increase the level of responsibility in attitudes toward alcohol use, increase the level of knowledge about alcohol, and reduce the incidence of negative behavior consequences experienced by students as a result of drinking" (p. 2). Using a control group, experimental group design and a pretest, post test I, post test II measurement, Gonzalez found a significant difference between groups for knowledge immediately after the presentation. This difference in knowledge level continued after three months, as measured by the second post test. There was a significant difference in responsible attitudes between groups after three months, with the experimental group illustrating a more positive attitude. There was no change in negative behavior consequences for either group.

Lewis-Shaffer, Popour, Booth, Weston, Barnes, and Lorenz (1980) studied assertion training and how it might affect behavior in alcohol-related situations. Although not conclusive, the study of assertion training did show that this type of training can be effective in modifying unassertive attitudes and behaviors in college students. This in turn suggests that "offering behavioral rehearsal and coaching to specific alcohol related situations would result in a better change of assertive behaviors occurring in real life alcohol related situations" (Lewis-Shaffer, et. al., 1980, p. 10).

Discussion

In all the studies reported, attempts were made to measure an alcohol education strategy's ability to alter student knowledge, attitudes, and behavior. All studies which attempted to increase knowledge were successful. More than half of the studies designed to change attitudes were successful. Less than one-half reported significant behavior changes.

Three studies which looked specifically at drinking and driving found this behavior decreased with education and that students became more tolerant of drinking one drink per hour when driving and more supportive of stricter drinking and driving laws.

Despite the limitations of self-report data previously discussed, the percentages of success seem strong enough that educators need to take note. The evidence reported indicates quite clearly that the focus on responsible use of alcohol and the encouragement of respect for nondrinkers is working on two of three areas: knowledge and attitude change.

The activities most successful in altering attitudes were those which took place over time or involved more than one meeting with a facilitator. This translates into the overwhelming potential for academic courses on alcohol and health and awareness weeks which include multiple programs for students.

The strategies and concepts that are effective as discussed in this article may best be summarized by a collection of best practices.

Rozelle and Gonzalez (1979) and Kraft and Hornik (1980) suggest the potential for peer-based education through the use of trained students as facilitators in classes and in workshops. In planning and implementing alcohol education, most authors recommend the development of com-

TABLE 3
Evaluation of Voluntary Participation Alcohol Education Activities

SOURCE	PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	Significant change in: KNOWLEDGE	ATTITUDE	BEHAVIOR
Chen, Dorsch & Cychosz (1982)	To determine the effectiveness of a voluntary education program on drinking attitudes and behaviors of college students.	NM*	YES	YES
Engs, DeCoster, Larson & McPherson (1978)	To test the cognitive effects of a voluntary alcohol education program.	YES	NM	NM
Gonzalez & Wiles (1981)	To determine how often alcohol was involved in discipline cases and the results of an awareness referral program.	YES	YES	NO
Gonzalez (1980)	To answer the question: "Does the alcohol education module increase level of knowledge about alcohol, and reduce incidence of negative behavior experienced by students as a result of drinking?"	YES	YES	NO
Lewis-Shaffer, Popour, Booth, Weston, Barnes, & Lorenz (1980)	To test whether a two-session assertion training workshop can be effective in increasing assertive behavior in alcohol related situations.	NM	NM	NO

NM = not measured

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

mon campus definitions of responsibility and prevention related to alcohol consumption and abuse, respectively. From these definitions, clear goals for program results can be developed (Kraft & Hornik, 1980; Mills, Pfaffenberger & McCarty, 1981; Swanson, 1978; Gonzalez, 1980; Gonzalez & Kouba, 1979; and Goodstadt, 1981).

Several authors also stressed the importance of documenting campus alcohol problems. This moves the approach away from trying to resocialize groups of people to behave in a more responsible manner and toward a community focus on eliminating a common problem (Mills, Pfaffenberger & McCarty, 1981; Mills, Neal & Peed-Neal, 1983).

What works well on one campus does not always work well on another campus. The University of Massachusetts had much more success with workshops than the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill did using the same workshop formats. Contextual factors in implementing any program must be acknowledged. It is important in applying any of these strategies that time be spent assessing what the particular population will respond to positively.

Finally, D. Kraft (1977) suggests that to be most effective, alcohol education programs should build on already existing, related programs.

Conclusion

In looking at evaluative studies, the positive picture must be tempered by the fact that negative results are seldom reported. In addition, most programs are evaluated by individuals involved internally rather than by an external consultant.

Regardless of these evaluation issues, student affairs staff must determine if alcohol education has merit beyond or in addition to creating knowledge, attitude, and behavior changes. Alcohol is such a pervasive part of campus social activities that awareness raising may be an appropriate goal for alcohol education. In addition to awareness raising, student affairs professionals must consider other issues:

1. There is some suggestion that the environment is encouraging alcohol abuse (McBrien, 1980) and that education activities should focus on altering environmental factors versus individual behaviors.
2. Future programming efforts may need to spend more time acknowledging the role of alcohol in college and social situations and recognizing that many students already drink responsibly.
3. Primary prevention through alcohol education activities may increase the use of counseling services and other assistance programs on the campus. These services need to be prepared.
4. Rather than focusing on quantitative and somewhat speculative changes in attitude and behavior, practitioners should focus on qualitative indicators that illustrate shifts in desired directions.

Alcohol education programs cannot be expected to eliminate alcohol abuse, but it may stop the increase of abusive consumption and decrease the number of students experiencing chronic problems.

References

Blum, S. B., Rivers, P.C., Horvat, J., & Bellows, D. The effect of contracted abstinences on college students behavior toward alcohol use. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*, 1980, *25*, 70-77.

Brooks, M. L. Personality variables in alcohol abuse in college students. *Journal of Drug Education*, 1981, *11*, 185-189.

Chen, W.W., Dorsch, M., & Cychosz, C.M. The impact of a voluntary educational program, "Tip it Lightly, Alcohol Awareness Week," on the drinking attitudes and behaviors of college students. *Journal of Drug Education*, 1982, *12*, 125-135.

Crosby, R.D., & Rubinstein, G.E. *Annual Evaluation Report FY 1980-81*, University of Nevada-Reno Alcohol Project. Rockville, Md.: National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 1981.

Dean, J.C., & Bryan, W.A. (Eds.) *Alcohol programs for higher education*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982.

Dennison, D. The effects of selected field experiences upon the drinking behavior of university students. *Journal of School Health*, 1977, *47*, 38-41.

Dennison, D., & Prevet, T. Improving alcohol related disruptive behaviors through health instruction. *Journal of School Health*, 1980, *50*, 206-208.

Dennison, D., Prevet, T., & Affleck, M. Does alcohol instruction affect student drinking behavior? *Health Education*, 1977, *8*, 28-30.

Duston, E., Kraft, D.P., & Jaworski, B. Alcohol education project: Preliminary answers. *Journal of the American College Health Association*, 1981, *29*, 272-278.

Engs, R.C., DeCoster, D., Larson, R.V., & McPherson, P. The drinking behavior of college students and cognitive effects of a voluntary alcohol education program. *NASPA Journal*, 1978, *15*, 59-64.

Engs, R.C., & Hanson, D.J. Drinking patterns and drinking problems of college students: 1983. *Journal of Studies of Alcohol*, in press.

Gonzalez, G.M. The effect of a model alcohol education module on college students' attitudes, knowledge and behavior related to alcohol use. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*, 1980, *25*, 1-11.

Gonzalez, G.M., & Kouba, J.M. Comprehensive alcohol education: A new approach to an old problem. *NASPA Journal*, 1979, *16*, 7-14.

Gonzalez, G.M., & Wiles, W. The incidence of alcohol usage as a factor in student disciplinary cases. *NASPA Journal*, 1981, *19*, 33-38.

Goodstadt, M.S. Planning and evaluation of alcohol education programmes. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*, 1981, *26*, 1-10.

Kraft, D.P. Follow up of a federal effort to encourage campus alcohol abuse prevention programs. *Journal of the American College Health Association*, 1977, *26*, 150-153.

Kraft, D.P. College students and alcohol: 50 + 12 project. *Alcohol Health and Research World*, 1976, *1*, 10-14.

Kraft, D.P. & Hornik, J. *Evaluation report for the university model*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, Demonstration Alcohol Education Project, 1980.

Kraft, J. *Iowa State University Alcohol Education Program Status Report March 1977-1981*. Ames: Iowa State University, 1981.

Kraft, J. *Iowa State University Alcohol Survey 1979, Report of findings*. Ames: Iowa State University, 1979.

Kuder, J.K., & Madson, D. College

student use of alcoholic beverages. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1976, *17*, 142-144.

Lewis-Shaffer, C., Popour, J.L., Booth, S.M., Weston, B., Barnes, E., Jr., & Lorenz, P.A. *Site specific impact evaluation: Effect of assertion training on college students' behavior in alcohol specific and non-specific situations.* Rockville, Md.: National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 1980.

McBrien, R. Facilitating moderate drinking on campus. *NASPA Journal*, 1980, *18*, 23-27.

McKillip, J. *Summary of Evaluation Findings 1978-81.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University-Carbondale, Alcohol Education Project, 1981.

Mills, K.C., Neal, E.M., & Peed-Neal, I. *Handbook for Alcohol Education, the Community Approach.* Cambridge: Balinger Publishing Company, 1983.

Mills, K.C., Pfaffenberger, B., & McCarty, D. Guidelines for alcohol abuse prevention on the college campus: Overcoming barriers to program success. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1981, *52*, 399-414.

Portnoy, B. Effects of a controlled usage alcohol education program based on the health belief model. *Journal of Drug Education*, 1980, *10*, 181-195.

Robinson, J., III. A comparison of three alcohol instruction programs on the knowledge, attitudes and drinking behaviors of college students. *Journal of Drug Education*, 1981, *11*, 157-166.

Rozelle, G. Experiential and cognitive small group approaches to alcohol education for college students. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*, 1980, *26*, 40-54.

Rozelle, G., & Gonzalez, G. A peer facilitated course on alcohol abuse: An innovative approach to prevention on the college campus. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*, 1979, *25*, 20-30.

Strange, C.C., & Schmidt, M.R. College student perceptions of alcohol use and differential drinking behavior. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1979, *20*, 73-79.

Swanson, J.C. The 'no win': Drug education evaluation problem. *Journal of Drug Education*, 1978, *8*, 125-129.

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. *Final Report: Prevention model replication program UMASS.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1981.

Oblander

Frances W. Oblander is a doctoral degree candidate in the higher education administration program at Indiana University . She has implemented alcohol education programs based on the BACCHUS model at both Southeast Missouri State University and Indiana University.

FYI: *Resources for Alcohol Awareness Week*

Alcohol education is a continuous program, not limited by the dates of the National Collegiate Alcohol Awareness Week. Alcohol education workshops in fraternities, sororities, and residence halls, a speaker series on alcohol-related issues, bumper sticker campaigns, and pamphlet distribution are just a few of the activities that can be scheduled throughout the year. The following agencies and organizations can provide information and publications for your alcohol education programs.

AA World Services, Inc., P.O. Box 459, Grand Central Station, New York, NY 10017.

Al-Anon and Alateen Literature, P.O. Box 182, Madison Square Garden, New York, NY 10010.

These are the literature outlets for Alcoholics Anonymous and Al-Anon. Materials are aimed at people who have alcohol problems or are involved with alcoholics.

Alcohol and Drug Addiction Research Foundation, 33 Russell St., Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 2S1.

This organization, which has a sound reputation for high quality work, publishes factual, well-researched pamphlets, books, and periodicals.

BACCHUS, % Campus Alcohol Information Center, 124 Tigert Hall, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611; (904) 392-1261.

BACCHUS is an acronym for Boost Alcohol Consciousness Concerning the Health of University Students. BACCHUS has campus chapters in the United States and Canada and distributes numerous materials, including a 200-page manual titled *Model Programs of Alcohol Education in Institutions of Higher Education.*

Communications and Public Affairs Dept., D-1, Kemper Insurance Companies, Long Grove, IL 60049.

The following pamphlets are available from Kemper: "Management Guide on Alcoholism and Other Behavioral Problems," "Detour Alcoholism Ahead," "What about Drugs and Employees," "Guide for the Family of the Alcoholic," and "The Way to Go."

ComCare Publications, 2415 Annapolis, Suite 140, Minneapolis, MN 55441.

ComCare distributes a wide variety of publications on alcohol and "growth-centered" topics.

National Clearinghouse for Alcohol Information, P.O. Box 2345, Rockville, MD 20852; (301) 468-2600.

The Clearinghouse distributes free, federally sponsored materials about alcohol and alcoholism.

National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857.

The Whole College Catalog about Drinking, Prevention on Tap, posters, pamphlets, and other information concerning college-based prevention programs are available from this organization.